DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 403 735 FL 023 922

AUTHOR Ghaith, Ghazi M.
TITLE Teacher Preparation through Cooperative Learning.
PUB DATE Mar 96
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (30th, Chicago, IL, March 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Teaching Guides (For Teacher) (052) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Class Activities; Curriculum Development; Educational Strategies; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Language Teachers; Teacher Education; *Teacher Education Curriculum

ABSTRACT

Seven class activities using cooperative learning techniques are proposed as appropriate for second language teacher training. The activities draw on the pro-social aspect of cooperative learning that offers second language learners maximum opportunities for active communication, reinforcement, and development of cognitive skills. Background is offered in the theory of cooperative learning techniques as it relates to language learning and to teacher education. The seven activities are then described, including their aims, necessary preparation, specific procedures, and sample review questions to follow the exercise. The activities include: a group test as an opener; a mixed review of previous materials; a think-pair-share exercise; an exercise to create awareness of and elicit comments on content material; a technique for funding something positive, negative, or interesting in a reading passage; and two "jigsaw" activities for teaching new material to others. Contains 18 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Ghazi M. Ghaith

Teacher Preparation Through Cooperative Learning

ED 403 735

This article presents a number of cooperative learning (CL) information processing structures as a mechanism for second language (L2) teacher training. The structures drew on CL as a prosocial form of education that offers L2 learners maximum opportunities of active communication, reinforcement, and cognitive work.

The article is based on the authors' involvement in restructuring teacher education at the American University of Beirut (AUB). The AUB Department of Education offers two post graduate programs leading to the Teaching Diploma (TD) and Masters' degree (MA) in education with emphasis on teaching English as a second / foreign language, TESL/TEFL. In addition, the Department conducts regular inservice training workshops for teachers of English in Lebanon and the Middle East. The student-teachers and participants in the workshops usually have little or no training in education. They have completed their undergraduate education in English or a related field, but have not really had courses in language education. Consequently, we often face the problem of filling gaps in their knowledge of the theories of language acquisition, the theoretical principles of the various L2 methods, and the processes involved in the various language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing). Thus, we sought to incorporate into our programs efficient methods that ensure proper integration of content and methodology. CL was perceived as connection between FL theoretical principles and classroom practice.

CL and Language Education

Over the past few decades, there has been a renewed interest in CL as a prosocial approach for improved academic achievement, intellectual development, and language learning. Research has shown that CL promotes higher achievement than all forms of individualistic learning across all age levels, subject areas, and all tasks except perhaps rote and decoding kinds of tasks (Johnson et al., 1981; Slavin, 1983b, Smith et al. 1984). Studies also report improved social development such as liking of classmates (Slavin, 1979), reduced social stereotyping and discrimination (Cohen, 1980),

FL023922

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ghazi M. Ghaith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

better intellectual competence (Kagan, 1989). Likewise, studies show gains in activities related to academic performance such as increased peer tutoring (Cohen and Kulik,1981), increased frequency of practice (Armstrong et al. 1981), and increased time on task (Slavin, 1983a).

Research has also shown that CL fosters language development and integration of language and content through increased active communication and use of language for academic and social functions. In the traditional language classroom, teachers do most of the talking where only 20-25 percent of students actually listen to the teacher (Cohen, 1984). Furthermore, student language production is sequential, one student at a time. This results in minimal student language production. In contrast, up to 80 percent of CL class time may be rescheduled for activities that include simultaneous student talk (Olsen and Kagan, 1992. This increased communication can be important to language learners especially limited English proficient (LEP) learners who usually receive less teacher and peer communication in the traditional classroom. Furthermore, the linguistic complexity of communication increases as the learners are engaged in stating new information, giving explanations, offering rationales, and showing integration of information (Olsen and Kagan,1992). This increased complexity often results in higher quality discourse as students better comprehend each other as well as take opportunities to practice their paralinguistic skills - gestures and facial and shoulder expressions.

CL and Teacher Preparation

The preceding benefits of CL have prompted educators to expand its applications into the domains of preservice and inservice teacher preparation. For example, Shaw (1992) argued for CL as a significant component in the graduate level preparation of language teachers. Shaw built his argument on the premise that demonstrating and experiencing CL enhances the effectiveness of teacher preparation, adds enjoyment to the learning experience, and improves teachers' self esteem and preparedness to work with other teachers. Furthermore, incorporating CL into teacher education programs is consistent with widely accepted claims that aspects of methodology are best inculcated

in teachers-in-training by direct experience and demonstration. In addition, CL has much wider applications than many recent FL methods as it can be used with larger groups of learners and is not committed to a particular view of language learning or a particular syllabus.

Based on the above assumptions, Shaw (1992) proposed a scheme for incorporating CL into FL teacher preparation programs. This scheme suggested linking aspects of content such as theories of FL acquisition and methodology, sociolinguistics, and practicum to various CL methods such as Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD), Teams Game Tournament (TGT), Jigsaw, and Couching (Cooperative Teaching).

Along similar lines, Winn-Bell Olsen (1992) Suggested a format for conducting in service workshops in CL. This format consists of the following steps:

1. Establish presenter's credibility while developing whole group unity
2. Form small groups as teams
3. Build team unity
4. Explore information processing structures
5. Investigate other cooperative techniques
6. Explore social considerations
7. Plan for ongoing development

(Winn-Bell Olsen, 1992, P. 207).

The above scheme and format can be used as functional guidelines for incorporating CL into teacher preparation. As such, these guidelines can be supplemented with other CL methods and information processing structures. What follows in the subsequent sections of this article are some activities that I have found useful.

Activities

The activities are based on content-free CL structures. Thus, teacher trainers may incorporate into the activity structures any content provided that the nature of this content lends

itself for the structure. For instance, while the Mixer Review structure can be used to teach any subject matter at any level, the Jigsaw structures can be used to teach materials in narrative form.

Activity #1

A Group Test as an Opener

AIMS

. to focus students' attention on major points

. to illustrate the support and power of the group

PREPARATION

. Prepare a group test on the material under consideration

PROCEDURE

. Announce the test and pass it out explaining to the group that they may discuss each question and arrive at consensus answers

. Set a time limit

. Go over the answers when the time is up and elaborate on the major points

Sample of a group test as an opener:

Choose the answer that the group agrees is best

Multiple choice:

a. Reading comprehension is a highly complex process

b. Knowledge of the linguistic code influences reading comprehension

c. Reading comprehension is a problem-solving activity

d. All of the above

True or false

T---- F---- Whereas the organizational unit for written discourse is the sentence, spoken language is generally delivered a clause at a time.

T---- F---- In most written material, the grammatical conventions of the language are not carefully observed.

T---- F---- In well-written discourse, sentences follow a logical sequence and there is evidence of planning.

Short Answers

What are some similarities between listening comprehension and reading comprehension?

Information source for the above questions is Omaggio A. (1986). Teaching Language in Context Proficiency-Oriented Instruction. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Pub. Inc.

Activity # 2

Mixer review

AIMS

. Participants cooperatively review materials previously studied together.

PREPARATION

. Develop a series of questions on material under study

PROCEDURE

a) Participants form two lines, facing each other.

b) Each person should be facing a partner in the other line.

c) Partners discuss the items on their question sheet. They use notes, old readings, or listen to other pairs if they get stuck . When they come to a mutually agreed on answer, each writes it down on his/her sheet.

d) At a signal from the teacher, one line moves down one so that every student is now facing a new partner. New partners answer question two, using the same procedure as in c.

e)The same procedure - moving down one - is repeated for each new question, until the sheet is completed.

f) When all questions have been completed in this manner, participants resume their seats and the teacher leads a discussion of the answers.

Sample Mixer Review Questions

Note: These were questions discussed in a previous class.

1. List two or more techniques associated with the Grammar Translation Method.
2. Name three schools of psychology that were popular in the early twentieth century.
3. List three types of conditioning involved in habit formation.
4. What does the term classical conditioning mean?

5. List two types of learning David Ausabel considered relevant to educational context.

6. List three factors on which meaningful learning depends.

Acknowledgment

This activity is an adaptation of an activity in Cooperative Learning in the Language Classroom for the TESOL Institute, San Francisco State University, 1989.

Information Source for the above questions is Omaggio A. (1986). Teaching Language in Context Proficiency-Oriented Instruction. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Pub. Inc.

Activity # 3

Think-Pair-Share

AIMS

. Participants cooperatively sort through their thoughts and silently rehearse explaining their answers to a partner

. To introduce materials and check comprehension

PREPARATION

Develop a a series of questions on material under study

PROCEDURE

a) Pose a question and have participants think of an answer

b) Have students pair-off and exchange answers

c) Have students volunteer to share their answers

Note: The sample Mixer Review questions in activity # 2 may be used with the Think-Pair-Share technique

Acknowledgment

The Think-Pair-Share technique was developed by Lyman F. (1989) "Re choreographing the Middle Level Minuet" The Early Adolescent Magazine , IV, I, 22-24.

Activity # 4

Pavlik's Procedure

AIMS

To create awareness of and elicit comments on content material

PREPARATION

. No special preparation is required

PROCEDURE

a) Introduce a topic and talk about it for ten minutes

b) Tell each participant to turn to the person sitting next to him/her and tell him or her what he/she was thinking about during the presentation

Acknowledgment

This technique was developed by Pavlik R. (1987). " Content Area Reading" Keynote address at Tri-TESOL. in Seatle, Washington.

Activity # 5

PIN (Positive-Interesting-Negative

AIMS

. To provide redundancy and additional negotiation of meaning

PREPARATION

No special preparation is required

PROCEDURE

a) Have students read a passage

b) Ask students to identify something that is in their view positive, interesting, or negative

c) Ask students to explain their identifications in some detail.

Acknowledgment

This technique was developed by de Bono (1933). "Thinking Course" NewYork: Facts on File Publications.

Activity # 6

Jigsaw Type 1

AIMS

.Participants cooperatively read a journal article or a chapter of a book as they practice the dynamics of using the Jigsaw type 1 method.

PREPARATION

. Duplicate enough copies of a journal article or chapter

. Divide the article or chapter into four sections

. Prepare guiding questions for the four sections (optional)

PROCEDURE

. Divide the class into groups

. Give each group a section of the article or chapter. If you have more groups than the sections, assign some sections to more than one group.

. Ask the groups to read, discuss, and prepare to summarize their sections to the whole class

. Provide each group with visuals for presentations

Sample of guiding questions for "Cooperative Professional Development" by Allan A. Glalthorn, 1987. Educational Leadership 45, 31-35.

Section 1: pp.31-32 to middle of column 3 (stop at Curriculum Development)

1. What does the author mean by "cooperative professional development?"

2. Describe the process and purpose of professional dialogue.

3. Make one more question about this section and answer it.

Section 2. pp. 32-33 "Curriculum Development"; and p. 34 "Action Research," Columns 2 and 3.

1. What does the author mean by "curriculum development?"

2. What is meant by "action research?"

3. Make one more question about this section and answer it.

Section 3. pp. 33-34 (stop at action research).

1. List nine characteristics of peer supervision

2. List five major functions of peer coaching

3. Make one more question about this section and answer it

Section 4. pp. 34-35

1. What are the supportive conditions for cooperative development?

2. What is the suggested specific process for implementation?

3. Make one more question about this section and answer it.

Acknowledgment

This activity was developed by Judy Winn-Bell Olsen in a workshop at San Francisco State University, California.

Activity # 7

Jigsaw Type II

AIMS

. Participants cooperatively learn about the FL methods as they practice the dynamics of using the jigsaw type II method.

PREPARATION

. Duplicate enough copies of three expert reading passages (A,B,C)

.Prepare questions worksheets on the passages

PROCEDURE

. Divide the class into heterogeneous groups of three based on previous study of linguistics, language spoken, place of birth, or gender

. Assign students to expert groups at random

. Students receive expert topics and read assigned materials to complete expert sheets

. Student-experts return to their teams to teach their topics to their team mates

. Students take individual quizzes

. Students figure out their individual improvement points and team scores by comparing their scores on the present quiz to those of the past quiz (base score). The following guidelines suggested by Slavin (1990) can be used:

Quiz	Improvement Points
More than 10 points below base score	0 points
10 points to 0 points below base score	10 points
Base score to 10 points above base score	20 points
More than 10 points above base score and perfect paper regardless of base score.	30 points

. Students recognize their teams according to the following guidelines suggested by Slavin (1990).

Criterion (Team Average)	Award
15 points	Good Team
20 points	Great Team
25 points	Super Team

Sample expert reading A and exercises

Reading A and exercises

The Grammar Translation method is not new. It has had different names, but it has been used by language teachers for many years. At one time it was called the Classical Method since it was first used in the teaching of the classical languages, Latin and Greek. Earlier in this century, this method was used for the purpose of helping students read and appreciate foreign language literature. It was also hoped that, through the study of the grammar of the target language, students would become more familiar with the grammar of their native language and that this familiarity would help them speak and write native language better. Finally, it was thought that foreign language learning would help students grow intellectually; it was recognized that students would probably never use the target language, but the mental exercise of learning would be beneficial anyway. (Source: Larsen-Freeman D. (1986). Techniques and Principles of Language Teaching New York: Oxford University Press, p. 4.

Exercises:

True, False, Or?

Write T if the statement is true, F if it is false, and OR? if you can find the answer in your reading.

1------ The Grammar Translation Method is not a new method.

2 ------ The Grammar Translation Method has different names.

Short Answers

3 List three objectives of foreign language learning according to the Grammar Translation Method.

Find the Word

4. Find the word in the passage to match the meaning bellow

a) Classical languages: ----------

b) Classical Method ----------

Note: readings for expert groups B and C and corresponding worksheets may be developed as in A above.

Sample quiz.

Use information from A, B, and C readings to answer the following questions:

1. Developing mental acquity is the primary goal of

a) The Grammar Translation Method

b) The Direct Method

c) The Audio-lingual Method

2. Descriptive linguistics and behavioral psychology led to the development of

a) The Grammar Translation Method

b) The Direct Method

c) The Audio-lingual Method

3. What is the most important reason(s) for the development of the Audio-lingual method?

4. List two differences between the Grammar Translation Method and the Direct Method.

5. What is the most serious limitation of the Grammar Translation Method?

Conclusion

I have attempted to present activities for incorporating cooperative learning (CL) into second language (L2) teacher preparation. There are certainly more activities that teacher trainers may draw on. What is important is using the activity structure that is well-suited to the nature of material under consideration.

References

Armstrong, B., D. Johnson, and B. Balow. (1981). Effects of cooperative versus individualistic learning experiences on interpersonal attraction between learning-disabled and normal-progress elementary school students. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 6, pp. 102-109.

Bejarano, Y. (1987). A Cooperative small-group methodology in the language classroom TESOL Quarterly, 21, 3, pp. 483-504.

Cohen, A. (1980). Design and redesign of the desegregated school: Problems of status, power, and conflict. In W.G. Stephan and J. R. Feagain (eds.), Desegregation: Past, Present, and Future. New York: Plenum Press.

Cohen, A. (1984). Introspecting about second language learning. Paper presented at the Ninth ILASH Conference, Netenya, Israel.

Cohen, A. and J. A. Kulik. (1981). Synthesis of research on the effects of tutoring. Research Information Service, 39, pp. 227-229.

De Bono, E. (1933). de Bono's Thinking Course. New York: Facts on File Publications.

Johnson, D., G. Muruyama, R. Johnson, D. Nelson, and L. Skon (1981). Effects of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic goal structures on achievement: A meta analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 89, pp. 47-62.

Kagan, S. (1989). Cooperative Learning Resources for Teachers. San Juan Capistrano, CA: Resources for Teachers.

Lyman, F. (1989). Recoreographing: the middle-level minuet. The Early Adolescent Magazine, IV, I, pp. 22-24.

Olsen, R. and Kagan S. (1992). About cooperative learning. in Kessler C. (ed.) Cooperative Language Learning A Teacher's Resourcebook. Englewood Cliiffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Pavlik, R. (1987). Content Area Reading. Keynote address at Tri-TESOL in Seatle, Washington.

Shaw, P. (1992). Cooperative learning in graduate programs for language teacher preparation. In Kessler C. (ed.) Cooperative Language Learning A Teacher's Resourcebook. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall.

Slavin, R. (1979). Effects of biracial learning teams on cross-racial relationships. Journal of Educational Psychology, 72, pp. 381-387.

-------- (1990). Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

-------- (1983a). Cooperative Learning. New York: Longman.

-------- (1983b). When does cooperative Learning increase student achievement? Psychological Bulletin, 94, 3, pp. 429-445.

Smith, K., D.W.Johnson, and R. Johnson (1981). Effects of controversy on learning in cooperative groups. Journal of Social Psychology. 122, pp. 199-209.

Winn-Bell Olsen J.(1992). Cooperative inservice education. In Kessler C. (ed.) Cooperative Language Learning A Teacher's resourcebook. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall.